

**City of Taylorsville
Planning Commission Work Session
Minutes
Tuesday – August 24, 2004 – 6:00 p.m.
2600 West Taylorsville Blvd., Room No. 140
Taylorsville, Utah 84118**

Attendance:

Planning Commission

Angelo Calacino Chairman
Aimee Newton
Dama Barbour
Kristie Overson
Ted Jensen
Phil Hallstrom
Joan Rushton-Carlson

Community Development Staff

Mark McGrath, Director
Michael Maloy, City Planner, Dist 2
Dan Udall, City Planner Dist 3
Nick Norris, City Planner, Dist 1
Jean Gallegos, Secretary/Recorder

Public: Don Adams (Economic Development Director)

[18:07:18](#)

WELCOME: Commissioner Calacino called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. and explained the procedures to be followed this evening.

WORK SESSION

1. General Plan Discussion. (Chapter 5 (Economic Development) and Chapter 3 (Land Use)).

1.1 Chapter 3 – Land Uses (Presentation by Mark McGrath)

1.1.1 [18:08:02](#) Mr. McGrath gave his presentation, showing the format changes made to the General Plan and introducing some department branding into the Plan. He went over the amended colors which now match other marketing materials taken on by the City and introduced the numbering system. This all sets the tone and identifies the primary goal of the chapter. Of note is that reference is made to objectives instead of goals and it is broken down into sub-categories, then objectives. Also included now is a series of action statements and a single column format with white spaces on the edge of the page. [18:15:03](#) The goal is to improve the organization of the document and make it something that can be used easier than the old General Plan. The numbering system will be referenced in the Staff reports. There is no current land use map available at this point but will be the main point of discussion at the next work shop meeting. [18:26:19](#)

1.2 Mr. McGrath relinquished the floor to the Commission for discussion. [18:28:30](#)

1.2.1 **Commissioner Hallstrom** suggested that the annexation objectives be made a separate chapter due to the complexity of the issue. **Mr. McGrath** indicated that for the time being it would be better kept where it is for the purpose of discussion.

1.2.2 **Commissioner Newton** was of the opinion that the introduction was not reader-friendly for the lay person and felt it should be made easier to follow. [18:30:25](#) **Mr. Maloy** said that a change will be made to the introduction in the way of making an executive summary, which may help that issue.

1.2.3 **Commissioner Calacino** agreed that staff needed to gear the language more towards the general citizens than those trained in planning. He suggested there be a more distinct clarification as to whether Taylorsville is suburbanized or urbanized. [18:34:47](#) He asked if in the Introduction, Staff was trying to eliminate the item that says “support alternate modes of transportation”? **Mr. McGrath** advised that was correct in that they were unsure if that belongs in the land use chapter and will move it to the Transportation Chapter.

1.2.4 **Mr. McGrath** said that some of the charts need to be updated with the most current information and that will be done prior to the Plan being finalized. For instance the amount of vacant buildings is less than is indicated on the chart.

1.2.5 **Commissioner Newton** asked if the General Plan Land Use Map was going to be changed and **Mr. McGrath** advised that would be addressed at the next work session. **Commissioner Rushton-Carlson** asked if that would be referenced to the Zoning Map as well, to which **Mr. McGrath** advised that was correct.

1.2.6 **Commissioner Hallstrom** asked how this would affect the small area master plans both existing and future and **Mr. McGrath** said they would be adopted as addendums to the General Plan. That the Zoning Ordinance establishes the rules and must work with the land use map. [18:46:00](#)

1.2.7 [18:44:43](#) **Don Adams** suggested a matrix or table format which shows acceptable density ranges and corresponding zones. He would also like to create a business park designation.

1.2.8 [18:46:35](#) **Commissioner Hallstrom** advised that he is supportive of establishing districts within the City. He felt it was healthy for the citizens, was politically correct and works because it gives a strong sense of identity to designate their neighborhoods as districts. He was, however, against establishing them as community councils.

1.2.9 [18:49:31](#) **Commissioner Overson** discussed the second paragraph under Zoning Map and Ordinance (Page 3-5) with the comment that it says that the current ordinance is overly complicated and contains too many redundant classifications, with which she agreed. She asked what was going to be done to fix that. [18:50:28](#) **Mr. McGrath** said that there were a number of classifications that are going to be eliminated and others consolidated. He asked that Commissioners refer to the action statement box for possible answers. [18:51:39](#)

1.2.10 [18:52:15](#) **Commissioner Jensen** commented that he liked the smaller version of the Land Use Map and hoped that would lead to re-doing the Zoning Ordinance to make it match. He asked if mixed use areas could be combined in with others and shrink the map size further. **Mr. McGrath** advised that currently there are two different mixed development proposals, MD-1 and MD-3 and the difference is in the intensity between them. **Commissioner Jensen** felt that Residential Business and Mixed Use sounded very similar and asked if they could be merged into one. He also commented that Commercial sounded similar to high density mixed use. **Mr. McGrath** advised that Community Commercial generally is typically retail but there can be office and other types of commercial. A Mixed Development zone is an area where the uses are mixed altogether on the same piece of property, which may not be desirable in some areas. [18:54:07](#) There is also the Professional Office zone where only offices are allowed.

1.2.11 **Commissioner Jensen** asked if under Goal 3-3 (Page 3-5) Actions, the Planning Commission was allowed to edit the Highways Ordinance. **Mr. McGrath** said that they can if the City Council gives them the authority to do so. The reason for inclusion in this chapter is that there are a series of development oriented ordinances in the Highways Ordinance and maybe it could be transferred into the Zoning Ordinance. There are contradictions within the ordinance that need to be clarified for consistency. [18:56:06](#)

1.2.12 **Commissioner Jensen** referred next to Page 3-7, the paragraph dealing with 4015 West, citing the history of that area. Originally when people moved into the area they were given the assurance that was going to be a freeway or major highway, so they didn't develop that part for a few years. [18:56:52](#). Thereafter, they were informed that the freeway was going in at another location but that 4015 West was still going to be expanded. Finally Salt Lake County landscaped the area between the highway and the sidewalk, planted a tree in the middle of it and gave all the residents another hose so they could water it. The residents have never really thought of that strip as being their own property and it has consequently deteriorated. **Mr. McGrath** [19:02:25](#) agreed there is a lot of potential for improvement and suggested one option being an urban street scape design which brings town homes up close to the street with access off an alley situated to the rear.

1.2.13 **Commissioner Jensen** suggested looking at the possibility of extending the Small Area Master Plan all the way west to Redwood Road and also that 1300 West be considered as another potential area for a small area master plan.

1.2.14 **Commissioner Jensen** [19:06:30](#) spoke on the future of annexations saying that it is a very sensitive issue especially for people along 4015 West and felt that it should not be included as part of the General Plan but should be left up to the City Council and public opinion and the Planning Commission should stay out of that issue. **Mr. McGrath** replied that the reason it is included in the General Plan is that the Steering Committee had suggested it. [19:07:48](#) When discussing annexation, the subject of Kearns moves to the forefront. Kearns does not want to annex to any other City or be divided amongst the cities that surround them. They want to remain as one group and be a separate entity, however, that may not be economically feasible for them. There are as many positives to annexing Kearns as there are negatives, so the possibility should not be ruled out for Taylorsville to

annex Kearns. **Commissioner Newton** asked what the benefit was for having this in the land use chapter and **Mr. McGrath** said it is to eliminate the negative opinion of having Kearns join Taylorsville. **Commissioner Calacino** [19:15:30](#) felt that Taylorsville should welcome the people of Kearns for who and what they are and **Commissioner Jensen** added the fact that they are welcome here should be written into the General Plan.

1.2.15 **Mr. Norris** added that he understood that there were state laws requiring cities to have an annexation plan. [19:16:52](#). **Commissioner Hallstrom** said that the whole annexation concept should be discussed at the beginning and then overlay whatever is being done with the land use elements. **Mr. McGrath** advised that the City did not want anything in this document that resembled a feasibility study, which would have to be made before any type of annexation is considered. [19:18:30](#) **Commissioner Rushton-Carlson** felt that the last paragraph in the Annexation Section confirms that Taylorsville should only act on an annexation proposal if requested to do so by the Kearns community.

1.2.16 **Don Adams** [19:18:45](#) addressed the annexation issue by stating that from a community plan perspective and general plan, intentions must be clearly expressed. If asked to do so by the Kearns community, Taylorsville should express their terms for annexation clearly. There are a lot of technical questions to consider before annexation is contemplated. [19:21:42](#) **Commissioner Calacino** agreed that annexation is a significant issue and staff should expand on the action statement in the General Plan to establish some steps to be followed. [19:24:26](#)

1.2.17 **Commissioner Jensen** asked what was happening with the area between the residences and the sound walls where there is a small gap. [19:25:29](#) **Mr. McGrath** advised that it is all UDOT right-of-way and will probably end up poorly maintained because it is not under the City's control at this point. **Commissioner Calacino** suggested that looking at that issue may be appropriate when the Planning Commission deals with adopting resolutions. [19:26:54](#)

1.2.18 **Commissioner Rushton-Carlson** suggested on Page 3-5, Zoning Map and Ordinance, to include under Actions a list of other uses that might be acceptable upon application to the Planning and Zoning Commission for other types of zonings. [19:27:12](#) There has been discussion about amending the C-3 zone and to consider a need for a business park zone but maybe under each one of these zonings we could indicate a short list of which other uses might be compatible upon a special application. **Mr. McGrath** advised that some broad general guidelines could be established in the General Plan, but in terms of the specific uses, the appropriate place for that is in the actual Zoning Ordinance. [19:28:50](#) **Commissioner Rushton-Carlson** still wanted included in the General plan a short list of uses that might be considered. **Commissioner Calacino** said that would negatively impact the idea of simplification and would lead to problems. [19:31:45](#) **Commissioner Rushton-Carlson** said it was her intention to simplify things by making that short list of what is allowed under specific zones, for instance to show where under the land uses that an office building is allowed. **Commissioner Calacino** asked the Commission if they really want to have zones that segregate the uses, for instance an "office only" zone. He said he preferred to have general zones rather than specific uses delineated. **Commissioner Newton** asked if what Commissioner Rushton-Carlson wants is like under low density residential to add in parenthesis – i.e. single family home, churches, etc. **Commissioner Rushton-Carlson** said she would prefer having bullets saying not necessarily that these are allowed uses but rather other uses that could be approved by special application and to show on the land use map where, for instance, a business or office park could potentially be established. **Commissioner Calacino** advised that perhaps the simplest thing to do is expand upon some of the designations and include some typical common uses found in those land use areas.

1.2.19 **Mr. Maloy** advised that Staff plans to establish a better connection between the General Plan and the Zoning Ordinance in the next draft. [19:30:05](#)

1.2.20 **Summary:** Planning Commissioners suggestions include:

- Simplifying the uses into general zones and not call out every type of use, however, selectively expand on some of the designations and give examples of typical uses allowed. [19:33:46](#).
- Possibly erect new street signage and include thereon which district it is under. [19:37:04](#).
- Along 4015 West between 5400 South and 4700 South, look at tearing down some of the existing structures and erecting town homes. [19:38:26](#)
- Possibly eliminating the parcel lines on the land use map and just having zones (which Staff felt should be discussed further). [19:38:50](#)

- Work better with the Neighborhood, Community and Regional commercial classifications rather than C-1, C-2 and C-3 and make sure they comply with the appropriate designation. [19:42:25](#)
- It was felt the existing office designation is too restrictive and needs to be reworked. [19:44:46](#)
- Look at changing the residential business classification to transitional commercial/office. [19:46:18](#)
- Address issues of apartments, as buffering and number of units existing in the City. [19:46:53](#) Also define what the City's goals are in terms of establishing any new apartment complexes areas here. [19:51:05](#)
- Look at the residential zones surrounding shopping centers to make sure they will be appropriate for the immediate future. [19:49:54](#)
- There is a disparity in that town homes are allowed only in R-M zones, however, that a PUD can be established in any zone. [19:52:23](#)
- Staff suggestion that under Regional Commercial allow a mix of uses, to allow developers to build next to commercial sites. [19:52:55](#) As it now stands, it will prohibit the City from having a variety of uses in a commercial zone such as several uses on one piece of property or several uses within one structure. [19:53:42](#)
- Discussion relative to a possible classification for commercial that allows only mixed use. [19:55:51](#).
- Page 3-4 under Recreation Open Space, add the Jordan River, possibly under the trails system. [19:57:53](#) Because there is no designation for golf courses, it was suggested to make it a specific recreational activity or single recreation activity.
- Add a transportation overlay zone on the land use map for future light rail or rapid transit routes. Also suggested was a historic overlay zone.
- It was proposed to move the section on zoning map and ordinance towards the back of the land use section.
- Separate some of the Actions out and shorten the content. [20:01:36](#).
- Expand on the Small Area Master Plans and give them the word "District". Include the previous proposal to include extending the 4800 South Small Area Master Plan all the way west to Redwood Road and including new small area master plans for the 1300 West area and the area along 4015 West bordering Kearns. [20:03:13](#).
- Move annexation policy to stand alone or include in Chapter 8, Implementation.

1.3 **Chapter 5 - Economic Development Chapter (Presentation by Don Adams).**

1.3.1 **Mr. Adams** [20:04:41](#) gave an informal presentation saying the Planning Commission has not had a chance to get a lot of exposure to economic development as it involves looking at existing conditions and what the future philosophies and strategies are and how it relates to land use. He continued that economic development and land use tie well together and the intent this evening is to outline what is in the chapter and how it will affect Planning Commission decisions. The discussion tonight is in preparation for looking at the land use map next time. The Economic Development Analysis was achieved by looking at the existing conditions, population base and the age of the commercial centers, which is not good news in retail development.

1.3.1.1 **Commercial Centers.** The present physical life expectancy of a commercial center is about 12 years and is actually closer to 7 years. The centers in Taylorsville don't have the modern proto-type sizes. One example is the Boyer project on the northeast corner of Redwood Road and 5400 South where the parking depth is way too shallow and the property too narrow. Harmon's was one of the pioneers in Utah with the 5400 South and Redwood Road store, as it was the "super sized" grocery store of its age at about 60,000 square feet.

- The point is, Taylorsville has some slightly outdated centers. Small strip centers have changed and are not as deep anymore. In downtown Salt Lake City, there are retail centers on Main Street that are 40' wide and 120' deep. The strips now are made with a shallow depth and a very wide frontage. Every community is experiencing the degrading of existing commercial centers because most of them have not had standard upkeep. It is not uncommon to see a center go through a complete face lift every 7 to 10 years. Most centers here in Taylorsville have not had a face lift or the exterior presentation of the structures changed and are lacking in upkeep, maintenance and landscaping. These are all hindrances in attracting new tenants and there is a lack of investment.

1.3.1.2 **Tenant mix.** The flexible management of these centers is very noticeable. As the centers have begun to age, management is allowing in anyone who will pay the rent. That is fairly disruptive when it comes to major anchor tenants. Prospective tenants are about "image" and being the king of the center and if they are not able to control who some of their partners are in the deal, it impacts the sale. The current mix does not attract national tenants, who are very specific about who they will and will not locate with. They stipulate the size of their building, the size of their lot, amount of parking stalls and who their neighbors are and if those requirements are not allowed, they will not look at the site for their use. The City must recognize that and be prepared with an appropriate response to their demands. Their standards and demands do not vary from city to city, state to state. [20:10:41](#)

1.3.1.3 **Parking lot dimensions.** Mr. Adams had cited examples of shallow parking being a negative impact. He further indicated that potential tenants dictate the quantity of parking stalls they want, along with the depth for that parking. Taylorsville has ineffective circulation in existing commercial sites, which is a key element when potential tenants look at site planning. An example is the Family Center, which has plenty of traffic going past it but not a lot of people going in to it. The new owners are aware of this and are looking at options to control that. One problem is that there are many existing leases which specify whose parking is whose and those cannot be moved at this time due to that, even when there is a better tenant who is investigating relocation here. [20:12:28](#) Another problem is the parking area is poorly designed. None of these issues have quick fixes.

Commissioner Rushton-Carlson commented that there has to be a reason to bring people in and suggested something like what they have at the Gateway, maybe a joint effort between the City and commercial owners over there and use some of that parking that is never utilized to make it more pedestrian-friendly and put in something like a water feature and place where people can sit. **Mr. Adams** advised that will be addressed later. [20:13:56](#)

1.3.1.4 **Competition.** **Mr. Adams** said that 15 years ago, there was really no other place to shop in the southwest portion of the valley than the center at 54th and Redwood. Now there is Jordan Landing, a new development in Murray, a center on 70th South and Redwood Road in West Jordan and in West Valley City there are numerous commercial centers. When a new store is thinking about locating to a site, they consider factors such as a certain amount of people within a certain distance who earn a certain amount of money. Part of what is being noticed is that Taylorsville has been on a barely holding even or negative slide. Taylorsville is starting to come back slowly but is lagging behind the others.

1.3.1.5 **Household Income:** [20:16:01](#) Mr. Adams said that Economic Development is being very careful to determine the median income within the 1, 3 and 5 mile trade areas around Taylorsville, for example \$54,000 at 1 mile and at 5 miles it is \$48,000 which is very modest in relation to the entire Salt Lake Valley. When dealing with a tenant that is going to look at, for instance, Draper, (\$75,000 median income), it becomes a factor because they have more disposable income and therefore more buying power. Taylorsville is getting enough to make up for it in cross-through traffic but potential incoming tenants are definitely taking a look at that factor when thinking about relocating here. They compare how well kept neighborhoods are with the personal income figures to see if the two mesh. They will look at how many people are mortgaged and how many have second mortgages. In Taylorsville, the percentage having second mortgages is about 18% of the population. That is a little alarming even though the money may be going to a very good purpose.

1.3.1.6 **Employment:** Taylorsville's employment figures are considered to be better than average.

1.3.1.7 **Transportation:** Mr. Adams said to keep in mind that mobility is a vital component to any successful economic development process, be it retail or job creation. It is a double edged sword in that if people can get in, they can get out. If a consumer or employer cannot reach the destination efficiently, they will find a new location. Taylorsville, to some degree, has become a victim of its' own success. There is great mobility around the Family Center but it is getting so difficult to get to and from there that people are going to go somewhere else.

1.3.1.8 **Access Management:** Mr. Adams asked that access management be looked at as an economic development tool, not just reducing the amount of curb cuts but rather to make sure those curb cuts are designed for efficiency. It should be understood and respected that big box retailers want their accesses centered right at the main entrance. The solution is to figure out how to work the rest of the design around that and make sure the ancillary side shops are placed in the appropriate location and not shy away from the big entrance. There must be efficiently designed high speed ingress and egress points because it better controls congestion. [20:19:37](#) The traditional curb cuts with a high back curb and sidewalk five feet behind that and a drive apron going up to the sidewalk are a thing of the past. There is over a 14 degree change of angle between all of those components. Basically the sidewalk comes down to meet the curb cut as opposed to the curb cut meeting the sidewalk. This is a minor change and could add years to the life cycle of the center. Installation of striped deceleration lanes is another positive impact to better channel the drivers. Land use and transportation are very tightly connected with road shapes and land use patterns. Right now Taylorsville has more retail commercial space than it can support. The old consumer base is gone and Taylorsville has been severely impacted by the new commercial centers erected in the immediate vicinity in surrounding cities. Taylorsville needs to focus on upgrading the "A" sites (Family Center, 54th and Redwood, I-215 and 4700 South, Bangerter Highway and 5400 South). At 4800 South and Redwood a "B" site, which needs considerable upgrade and the City needs to think of the "C", "D" and "F" sites as transitioning into different land uses. The need to create employment centers is critical.

1.3.1.9 Mr. Adams summarized by saying this is not the Economic Development Plan but a general guide for the General Plan. They are inter-related but totally separate. Land use and transportation are very tightly connected. Commissioner Calacino's interpretation was a lot of it has to do with actually the way a property is designed to accommodate the use that is going to keep it healthy and sustainable. Mr. Adams continued that it is important to know where to put the transportation breaks to determine how the land use lays out. It also depends on where traffic is being loaded onto a roadway, where the peak traffic periods are going to be and at which location. Retail strip design should be avoided because it is inefficient and doesn't meet modern retailing needs and will not attract a quality tenant base.

Neighborhood Revitalization: Image is everything and neighborhoods must keep themselves looking good in order to attract quality retailers and employers. [20:31:44](#) Ordinance enforcement is very important to economic development. Getting a program that loans out tools or a dumpster situated in a neighborhood for clean up is economic development. Small and mid-size businesses make decisions not necessarily based on economics but rather on life style choice of the owner or pressure from residents or employees. A stable and attractive housing stock creates stability. If a developer plans to invest millions of dollars in a project, they want the most stable community they can find.

Next Steps: Mr. Adams outlined the next series of steps as follows: First is the land use map and second is some modeling to make sure the City is at least staying even. Land use categories which are important, bring up the question as to whether we want to create specific zones such as a professional office zone. From an economic development standpoint, the answer is yes. It is important to say where professional offices are desired. Development is risky. If it were easy, everyone would be making a lot of money at it. If a developer is looking at a piece of property and it is listed as "office" both in the zoning ordinance and in the general plan, they would feel confident in getting that use. The chance taking potential surfaces if it is another type of zone. Professional planners know what will and will not work in a specific spot and should be trusted to make that decision. The City needs to focus on making appropriate decisions along Redwood Road so that an extra lane of traffic doesn't need to be added. Mr. Adams likes neighborhood commercial, community commercial and regional commercial designations, as long as the zones backing them up are equal to the designation. For example, neighborhood commercial is designed to serve a half to one mile surrounding so it is important that the uses in the zone are conducive to that. The business residential classification works for transitioning older homes into offices. Mixed use development is a good economic development tool especially if there is interest in a very intense project, such as the Gateway project in Salt Lake City. There are areas along 4700 South where such a project would work.

UDOT Property Issues: The Planning Commission and City Council need to get tough on this one. There has been enough analysis done to show what will and will not work. There is only one large parcel left and that is the UDOT property, which must generate revenue. Retail generates more revenue than does single family housing and also brings in employment. One draw back is that it is in such close proximity to Jordan Landing and the City also

wants to keep the Family Center viable. The General Plan should definitely show that a revenue generator is needed on this site.

Redevelopment Tools: There will be a lot of redevelopment project areas that will be brought before the Commission for decision such as currently vacant sites, i.e., the Food-4-Less site on 4015 West, some partial assemblage, and realignment of driveways for access to name just a few examples. Economic Development delves into the figures of how much a store sells and how much that same store needs to sell to survive. The biggest drawback on redevelopment is that it is much more difficult to do than to start out with a new project.

1.3.9.10 **Summary:** Economic Development and Community Development have identified specific areas and **Mr. Adams** asked the Commissioners to review those suggestions and offer comments. **Commissioner Hallstrom** said that there are developers out there interested in the UDOT property with less than honorable motives. **Mr. Adams** said that there is nothing that says the proposals can't be reviewed and more information asked for later on. Right now the absence of facts contrary to the analysis presented this evening is overwhelming. What the City does not want to do is in the absence of facts, to do nothing. They should go with the best information for that day especially with a piece of property with that much value. **Commissioner Calacino** commented that Mr. Adams had touched on the A through F site and wanted to know if the new draft of the General Plan shows that. He wanted to take a step forward and that when the Commission looks at the land use map at the next meeting, to possibly have a certain site identified on it and then say what the different land uses to be projected for the property would be. **Mr. Adams** advised that is presently being done. There can be an existing land use map sitting next to the general plan map and the changes staff has already made are noticeable. There will be some land use changes contemplated. **Commissioner Calacino** felt that it should be looked at to combine that element of the economic and land use now. **Mr. Adams** said it was his understanding that was what the issue would be at the next Planning Commission meeting. **Mr. McGrath** advised that the land use map would be reviewed at the next Planning Commission meeting where it would be determined what will be discussed at the work session after that, which may include a field trip to specific sites.

2. Possible Jordan River Overlay Ordinance.

Commissioner Calacino advised that Commissioner Jensen had E-Mailed the proposed ordinance on the Jordan River Parkway for the Commission to look at and offer comments. He turned the time over to Commissioner Jensen for an over view.

2.1 Commissioner Jensen said that other than simply caring about the area, he felt there were four major reasons why this overlay ordinance is needed:

2.1.1 The first reason brought out during a recent Citizen Planner Seminar was a warning against vagueness. If there is anything that is vague in the Code or not easily understood or defined, it will be challenged in court.

2.1.2 The second reason is because the General Plan is not an ordinance and the ordinance is not a General Plan, completely separated.

2.1.3 The third reason is that State Law does allow City's to mandate compliance between the Zoning Ordinance and the General Plan but Taylorsville doesn't have that.

2.1.4 The fourth reason is that property along the Jordan River, once it is developed for a certain purpose, there is no turning back. Once it is allowed, it stays that way. There must be a clear plan in place to do that.

2.2 **Commissioner Jensen** said that he went back to all the Cities that have property along the Jordan River and took notes of their findings and picked out those that seemed to fit the needs of the City the closest and that is what is being presented this evening.

2.2.1 **Commissioner Hallstrom** asked where this would apply, because there are some areas along the river that are built up on both sides. How much of the river is not now developed in some fashion that would preclude a parkway easement being established? **Commissioner Jensen** said it regulates development along the river. **Commissioner Hallstrom** asked what if that has already been done by virtue of re-zonings, subdivision plat, etc. and how much area in Taylorsville would fall under that. **Commissioner Jensen** said it would be sizable, especially if the golf course ever goes under.

2.2.2 **Commissioner Calacino** commented that in general the ordinance would affect the river as it runs through the City, period, whether there is development or not and any redevelopment or new developments would be subject to compliance with the new ordinance. It would be prudent for the Commission to take a hard look at this and see whether it is or is not going to apply. He asked if it would be possible to see how many properties along the river are still vacant and see what the affect of non-compliance properties would be. He added that the Commissioners have not had a chance to fairly review this yet and it is just on the agenda tonight for initial discussion. The Commissioners will then review and submit their red-line comments to staff to make a new draft and move it forward through the usual process.

2.2.3 **Commissioner Rushton-Carlson** complimented Commissioner Jensen on his efforts in preparing this proposed ordinance. She asked what the minimum setback from the river is in most of these areas now. **Mr. McGrath** informed her that the only areas where there are specific setbacks are within the 4800 South Small Area Master Plan, which is for 100'. Otherwise it is determined by the FEMA 100 year flood plain and State of Utah standards. **Commissioner Rushton-Carlson** asked if there were any areas in Taylorsville where it is closer than 100' from the river, to which, **Mr. McGrath** replied that he did not have access to those figures tonight.

2.2.4 **Commissioner Hallstrom** asked if a map could be prepared which shows how much ground is involved in this. **Commissioner Calacino** asked that staff create a map showing the length of the river through the City and include some general idea of the current uses. **Mr. McGrath** suggested that an aerial photo would be very helpful. [21:00:46](#) However, because of the priority given to staff to finish the General Plan, it was uncertain when this could be brought back at a work session. **Commissioner Calacino** asked that staff prepare the requested map and tentatively schedule this ordinance for Planning Commission review at the September work session and for the October meeting for approval.

MINUTES: Review/approval of Minutes for July 13, July 27 and August 10, 2004.

MOTION: By motion of **Commissioner Overson**, who stated that in view of the fact that there is an audio recording available for these meetings, that the Minutes be approved.

SECOND: **Commissioner Rushton-Carlson**.

VOTE: **Commissioner Newton** – AYE, **Commissioner Barbour** – AYE, **Commissioner Overson** – AYE, **Commissioner Jensen** – AYE, **Commissioner Hallstrom** – AYE, **Commissioner Smith** – AYE. Motion passes unanimously.

DISCUSSION: **Commissioner Calacino** wanted to discuss some on-going issues with the staff and Commission.

- #1. What to do with the land that is basically leftover in between the new sound walls and the properties along I-215.
- #2 A discussion item that the Planning Commission should establish some objectives and start laying out policies/ideas and put those in the form of a resolution. One example given was that the Staff is starting to work on a landscaping ordinance and Commissioner Calacino felt that it was important for the Commission to look at those types of issues and come up with some design standards. Included in that as a starting place for the process would be the sound walls referenced in #1.
- #3 He felt that one of the first resolutions would be looking at adopting some of the design tools and elements that Envision Utah put together in manual form. One is called Transit Oriented Development Design Guideline and the other is Envision Utah – Smart Growth Philosophies. He suggested that Staff set up a training session with Envision Utah, and include the City Council and the Commission.

DISCUSSION:

1. **Commissioner Hallstrom** said that the process needs to be defined as to how the presentation could be made and the follow-up process after that. Otherwise there would be too many of them being proposed. The process must be well thought out and have merit.
2. **Commissioner Rushton-Carlson** asked if Commissioner Calacino was thinking specifically of the UDOT property, the area along I-215, next to the UDOT office building where they have the track on 2700 West and across the street where they have the Driver's License Course, that are just

weeds basically. **Commissioner Calacino** replied that he didn't know if it were any one specific area but the thought presented itself to him when Commissioner Jensen asked what enforcement elements were in place for the Jordan River. **Commissioner Calacino** felt the Commission could look at issues like that and take a position, which usually requires a resolution about that. He felt that the Commission gets caught up in day to day current planning issues and doesn't spend enough time planning. He felt that as a Commission, they need to look out for the community and plan and use authority and take a position on issues. **Commissioner Hallstrom** felt that was easy said but not easily put into action. **Commissioner Calacino** still wanted to move forward to establish some sort of process, with the first step being including it in the by-laws.

3. **Commissioner Overson** said that what she is hearing is that the Commission needs to become more pro-active in expressing what the goals for the City are and asked what it meant if they made a resolution. **Mr. McGrath** was not sure if the solution needed to be in resolution form or not because a resolution has specific legal meanings. He added that he was aware of what Commissioner Calacino wants to establish [21:11:19](#) but wasn't sure if that was the correct way to do it.
4. **Commissioner Calacino** indicated that he just wanted to assure that the Commission actually starts doing something about the issues instead of just discussing them. He wants the Commission to make a policy statement when they want to see something done in a certain manner and recognize that it is an important issue or put a position together that helps staff in their reviews of projects. The Commission has the General Plan but also the Zoning Ordinance and there needs to be more specific development guidelines that govern the actual tree count, shrubbery count or species of trees in actual ordinance format. He felt a resolution was a tool that could be passed specifying the development standards, therefore, helping staff in their review of projects and giving them a point of reference in enforcing certain design standards.
5. **Mr. McGrath** advised that currently the Commission has a formal way of communicating to the City Council on specific applications that have a process to go through the Planning Commission and then to the City Council. For other things having to do with Planning and Zoning there presently is no formal way of communicating with the City Council. **Commissioner Hallstrom** said that he wanted to make sure that whatever is done is well thought out.
6. **Commissioner Rushton-Carlson** indicated that Mr. Adams had said that some of the big retailers thinking about coming to Taylorsville, drive through neighborhoods to get a feel for how well properties are maintained. She wanted to know how the City enforces the issue of absentee land owners, rental properties, etc. She was specifically interested in the number of people allowed to live in a home and the number of vehicles parking in and around there. **Mr. McGrath** advised that there is an existing Code Enforcement program which involves all three City Planners, which is usually focused on a complaint basis. There is, however, no control over how many people live within a home.

DISCUSSION: Mr. McGrath asked for permission to address the Commission on a couple of issues. Commissioner Calacino relinquished the floor to Mr. McGrath for that purpose.

- Mr. McGrath explained the content of the flyer placed in the Commission packets inviting them to attend a Citizen's Planner Seminar sponsored by the Utah League of Cities and Towns and offered the opportunity for any Commissioner wishing to attend to do so at the expense of the City.
- He advised that Wal-Mart has appealed the Planning Commission decision reference installation of the traffic signal on 1500 West and 5400 South prior to certificate of occupancy being issued to Wal-Mart's new super store. The appeal will be heard by the City Council on September 21, 2004 and has three options that night: (1) Either uphold the Planning Commission's decision and the issue is dead; (2) Remand the issue back to the Planning Commission for further consideration or (3) Choose to conduct a hearing of the appeal. Wal-Mart does not want their project held up by UDOT not getting the signal installed in time.
- Mr. McGrath commented that about two years ago, the development at 6200 South and Redwood Road appealed an issue to the City Council in which they actually upheld the appeal of the applicant

and thereby overturned the Planning Commission decision regarding access and internal circulation on the property. Mr. McGrath is now in receipt of a letter from the actual user of that property basically saying the City needs to do something about the situation. The Commission has been very concerned about access. Essentially, there was a small house at the intersection of 6200 South and Redwood Road that was converted to an office. The property owners came in and applied for a Conditional Use Permit for a significant expansion on a very small piece of property. One condition placed on the approval was that there had to be some type of cross access between the Bennion Care Center and this property to allow better access. The applicant said they tried to obtain that agreement, however, were not successful and appealed the Planning Commission decision to the City Council. Condition of the approval was that they do obtain that agreement and conduct a traffic study. Their traffic study indicated this project would be a nightmare without the cross access easement.

ADJOURNMENT: By motion of **Commissioner Overson**, the meeting was adjourned at 8:45 p.m.

Jean Gallegos, Secretary/Recorder
Planning Commission

Approved in meeting held December 14, 2004.